

**REMARKS**

The Office Action dated September 9, 2004 has been carefully considered, and it is noted with appreciation that claims 7-22 are allowed, and that the subject matter of claims 2-6 is allowable subject to the rewriting of claim 2 in independent form and to overcome the rejection of claims 2-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112. For the latter purpose, claim 2 is rewritten herein in independent form and, together with claim 1 from which it is dependent, is amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The amendment of claims 1 and 2 in this respect is set forth more fully hereinafter, and it is respectfully submitted that withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is in order, whereby withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of claims 23-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, the latter rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth hereinafter, whereby withdrawal of the rejection is in order and is requested.

It is the examiner's contention with regard to claims 1-6 and 23-28 that the specification does not reasonably provide enablement "...for said inner and outer surfaces being arcuate in the direction from said outer end toward said one end and converging in said direction (for claims 1-6), and method for sealing....to the substrate (for claims 23-28, lines 1-7)." Further in this respect, it is the examiner's contention that the specification does not enable a person skilled in the art to make or assemble the invention commensurate in scope with the claims. The examiner's contention in this respect is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

With regard first to claims 1-6, claims 1 and 2 are amended herein to delete "arcuate" in connection with the description of the inner and outer surfaces, and Figures 3 and 4 of the drawing and page 5 of the specification, lines 15-17, clearly provide enablement for the recitation that the

inner and outer surfaces converge as defined in claims 1-6. In this respect, the latter portion of the specification clearly states "...connecting wall portion 46 has radially outer and inner surfaces 78 and 80, respectively, which converge relative to axis 30 in the direction from end 34 toward end 32 of the grommet...." Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is in order and is respectfully requested.

With regard to claims 23-28, and in particular the examiner's reference to claim 23, lines 1-7, "A method of sealing a conductor having a diametrically larger connector on an end thereof relative to a substrate having opposite sides and an opening therethrough larger than the connector...." is clearly supported in the specification on page 3, lines 13-16. As the examiner well knows, a patent application is directed to one skilled in the art. Accordingly, the term "method" does not have to be set forth, and it is quite apparent to one skilled in the art that "facilitating the mounting of an electrical conductor" references a method for doing so. Further, the step of "...providing a resilient grommet having a first end for sealingly engaging the conductor and a second end radially spaced from the conductor and larger than the opening...." is clearly supported in Figures 3 and 4 of the drawing as well as on page 4, lines 22-27, and page 5, line 24, to page 6, line 1 of the specification. With further regard to the language of claim 23, "...mounting the grommet on the conductor with the first end facing the connector, inserting the connector and conductor through the opening from one side of the substrate, and sealing the second end of the grommet to the substrate" is clearly set forth on page 6 of the specification, lines 18-26. Again, the latter description clearly describes the method steps set forth in claim 23. Moreover, the method steps set forth in claims 24-28 are clearly defined on page 6 of the specification, line 26, to page 7, line 1, either alone or together with the description on page 6, lines 22-26.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that withdrawal of the rejection of claims 23-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is in order, whereby withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by patent 3,244,802 to Sturtevant, et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 clearly sets forth that one of the ends of applicants' grommet is for "sealingly engaging" with a conductor. The assembly of Sturtevant, et al. specifically includes two components, namely a grommet 18 and a resilient ball 20, as set forth in column 1, lines 51-53. As is quite clear from Figure 2 of Sturtevant, et al., the end 24 of the latter's grommet 18 which corresponds to applicants' "one end" does not sealingly engage conductor's 16 extending through the assembly. To the contrary, end 24 is radially spaced from the conductors. It is well established that for a reference to anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must show each and every element of applicants' claim. Sturtevant, et al. clearly does not meet this criteria, whereby withdrawal of the rejection based on Sturtevant, et al. and allowance of the claims is in order and is respectfully solicited.

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Sturtevant, et al. in view of patent 6,064,003 to Moore, et al. It is the examiner's contention in this respect that Sturtevant, et al. does not disclose a diametrically larger connector on an end of their conductor, and that the latter feature is disclosed in Moore, et al., whereby it would have been obvious to provide Sturtevant, et al. with a diametrically larger connector as taught by Moore, et al. The examiner's contention in this respect is respectfully traversed. The examiner has overlooked the limitation in claim 23 that applicants' method is for sealing a conductor having a diametrically larger connector on an end thereof relative to a substrate having an opening therethrough larger than the connector.

Sturtevant, et al. has no connector whatsoever and neither suggests nor makes obvious the inclusion of a connector and, in Moore, et al., it is obvious from Figure 1 that the connector 60 is larger than the opening 14 in wall 16 of the automobile. Accordingly, it would not be possible to have connector 60 attached to cable 20 and mounted on the door panel by inserting the connector and conductor through the opening as is required in claim 23. Mounting connector 60 on the conductor of Sturtevant, et al. would not overcome this shortcoming in Moore, et al. Any contention to the contrary clearly is not supported by the disclosures of either Sturtevant, et al. or Moore, et al. In particular with regard to the latter, there is no reference whatsoever to any method of installing the conductor's grommet and connector as a unit on the vehicle in accordance with applicants' method. It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that claim 23 patentably distinguishes from the combination of prior art and is allowable, together with claims 24-28 which are dependent therefrom.

Formal drawings replacing the informal drawings filed with the application are being submitted concurrently herewith.

An earnest effort has been made to place this application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 23-28 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

By:

JAMES W. MCKEE (Reg. No. 26,482)  
1100 Superior Avenue - 7th Floor  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579  
(216) 861-5582 (phone)  
(216) 241-1666 (facsimile)